



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,793	08/04/2006	Paul C. Kocher	2007014 / CRYP3CIP1US	3031
7590	05/07/2009		EXAMINER	
Patent Department Macrovision Solutions Corporation 2830 De La Cruz Blvd. Santa Clara, CA 95050			WRIGHT, BRYAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2431	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/563,793	KOCHER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BRYAN WRIGHT	2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 11-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/7/2009, 1/6/2009.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed 1/13/2009. Claim 1-7 and 11-19 are amended. Claims 20-29 are new. Claims 8-10 are cancelled. Claims 1-7, and 11-29 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 and 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traw et al. (US Patent No. 6,542,610 and Traw hereinafter) in view of Feder et al ( US Patent No. 5,668,954 and Feder hereinafter) and further in view of Jaisimha et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,663 and Jaisimha).

3. As to claim 1, Traw teaches a method for regulating access to storage within an audiovisual player device, the device configured for executing instructions in a Turing-complete interpreter, said method comprising: (a) receiving a request from said instructions being executed (i.e., ... teaches n accordance with the present invention, a compliant device ("Device A") which is a source of protected content (e.g., a DVD player) is requested to transmit protected content across a serial bus to another compliant device ("Device B")

which is a sink for protected content (e.g., a PC running an MPEG-2 video stream decoder) [col. 6, lines 40-46]), where said request specifies : (i) a portion of said storage for which access is requested (i.e., ... teaches a request to transmit protected content [col. 6, lines 45-50]), and (ii) a plurality of additional executable instructions (i.e., ... teaches preliminary authentication must be initiated if authentication has not been setup [col. 6, lines 50-60]);

(b) applying a cryptographic hash function to said additional executable instructions to obtain a hash value (i.e., ... teaches applying cryptographic hash resulting a hash function may be applied to a paired 54-bit content key [col. 7, lines 30- 35]);

(c) authenticating said hash value (i.e., ... teaches both devices verifies appropriate response to challenge [col. 7, lines 5-10]);

and (d) provided that said authentication is successful, enabling access by said instructions being executed to said requested portion of said storage while executing said additional executable instructions (i.e., ... teaches if response is successful a channel key between Device A and Device B is generated for which provides access to the protected content [col. 7, lines 45-55]).

Tray does not expressly teach:

the device further configured to render content for playback,  
and first portion of the storage for enabling rendering of the content by the device,

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Tray as introduced by Feder.

Feder discloses:

the device further configured to render content for playback (to provide a device configured to render content for playback [col. 6, lines 35-45]),

and first portion of the storage for enabling rendering of the content by the device (to provide a first portion playback control of content provided by storage [col. 7, lines 30-60]),

Therefore, given the teachings of Feder, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Tray by employing the well known features of a playback device and playback instruction provided by a storage medium disclosed above by Feder, for which playback control will be enhanced (col. 7, lines 30-60).

The combination of Traw and Feder does not expressly teach:

if the authentication is not successful, inhibiting at least one of the rendering of the content and execution of at least one feature associated with the content.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by the combination of Traw and Feder as introduced by Jaisimha. Jaisimha discloses:

if the authentication is not successful, inhibiting (e.g., terminating communication) at least one of the rendering of the content and execution of at least one feature associated with the content (to provide a inhibiting means for content playback for unsuccessful authentication [col. 11, 50-67]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Jaisimha, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the combination of Traw and Feder by employing the well known feature of inhibit content playback disclosed above by Jaisimha, for which playback control will be enhanced (col. 11, 50-67).

4. As to claim 2, Traw teaches a method where said step of authenticating comprises comparing said hash value with a hash value stored in said storage (i.e., ... teaches comparing hash data to determine if matches expected value [col. 16, lines 30-40])).

5. As to claim 3, Traw teaches a method where said step of authenticating comprises verifying a digital signature provided by said first set of instructions being executed (i.e., .. teaches verifying message signature [408, fig. 4(a)]).

6. As to claim 4, Traw teaches a method where said request includes a pointer to said additional executable instructions in memory accessible by said first set of instructions being executed and contained in said device (fig. 4(a)).

7. As to claim 5, Traw teaches a storage medium containing encrypted audiovisual content for playback on any of a plurality of device architectures [col. 12, lines 40-45], the storage medium comprising program logic configured to: (a) identify at least one characteristic of a device executing said program logic (i.e., ... teaches each device identifies a challenge value associated with the other device [col. 8, lines 30-40] ... teaches identify correct message signature (i.e., characteristic) between devices [col. 8, lines 40-50]); (b) use said at least one characteristic (i.e., challenge value) to determine which, if any, of a plurality of security weaknesses are present in said device (i.e., ... teaches compares challenge value of device A with challenge value of device B .... teaches authentication is based on equivalent challenge values [col. 7, lines 36-41] ... further teaches authentication of message signatures [col. 8, lines 55- 60]); (c) when said determination indicates a suspected weakness (i.e., ... teaches determining the signature is invalid, deeming a security treat [col. 8, lines 40- 55]), (i) select at least one of a plurality of software countermeasures (e.g., do not send protected content), wherein said selected countermeasure corresponds to said suspected weakness and is compatible with said device [col. 8, lines 40-55]; (ii) mitigate said suspected weakness by directing said device to invoke said selected countermeasure (e.g., do not send protected content) (i.e., ... teaches if signature is not valid do not send protected content [col. 8, lines 50- 60]); and (iii) decode said encrypted audiovisual content (i.e., .. teaches standard implementations of Blowfish, the permutation and substitution functions are

derived from the hexadecimal digits of .pi. and the specific key being used to encrypt/decrypt data within the content protection system. [col. 5, lines 10-25] .... teaches in this content protection system, Blowfish can be modified to allow the use of alternate initialization values for the permutation and substitution functions for decrypting data [col. 5, lines 10-25]), wherein said decoding includes a result produced by successful operation of said countermeasure logic [fig. 7]; and (d) when said determination does not indicate a suspected weakness, decode said audiovisual content by using at least one decryption key derived by using at least one cryptographic key associated with said device [fig. 6 and fig. 7].

8. As to claim 6, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is configured to execute in an interpreter common to a plurality of device architectures [fig. 8], and at least a portion of said selected countermeasure (i.e., embodiment) is configured to be executed directly as native code on a microprocessor associated with said device (i.e., ... teaches embodiments of the present invention may be implemented in hardware, or software executed by a computing device such as a microcontroller or microprocessor [col. 5, lines 45-50]).

9. As to claim 7, Traw teaches a storage medium further comprising a digital signature authenticating said native code portion (i.e., ... teaches validating message signature using DSA technology [col. 5, lines 50-60; 408,fig. 4(a)]).

10. As to claim 11, Traw teaches a automated method for determining whether to allow a portion of software to access a portion of a memory within an audiovisual player device, the method comprising:

(a) receiving a reference (i.e., request for protected content) to said portion of software (i.e., ... teaches n accordance with the present invention, a compliant device ("Device A") which is a source of protected content (e.g., a DVD player) is requested to transmit protected content across a serial bus to another compliant device ("Device B") which is a sink for protected content (e.g., a PC running an MPEG-2 video stream decoder) [col. 6, lines 40-46]);

(b) computing a cryptographic hash of said software portion [col. 7, lines 30- 35];

(c) comparing said computed cryptographic hash with a value stored in said memory [col. 13, lines 35-40],

(d) when said computed cryptographic hash matches said stored value, allowing said software portion to access said nonvolatile memory portion (i.e., Kpre\_control ) [312,316, fig. (a)];

and (e) when said computed cryptographic hash does not match said stored value, not allowing said software portion to access said nonvolatile memory (i.e., Kpre\_control ) [312,314, fig. (a)] and inhibiting at least one of:

Traw does not expressly teach:

allowing said software portion to access said portion of the memory for enabling rendering of the content by the device and permitting execution of at least one feature associated with the content;

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traw as introduced by Feder.

Feder discloses:

the portion of the memory for enabling rendering of the content by the device and permitting execution of at least one feature associated with the content (to provide a device configured to render content for playback [col. 6, lines 35-45]);

Therefore, given the teachings of Feder, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Traw by employing the well known features of a playback device and playback instruction provided by a storage medium disclosed above by Feder, for playback control will be enhanced (col. 7, lines 30-60).

The combination of Traw and Feder does not expressly teach:

inhibiting at least one of the rendering of the content or execution of at least one feature associated with the content,

the rendering of the content or execution of at least one feature associated with the content.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by the combination of Traw and Feder as introduced by Jaisimha. Jaisimha discloses:

inhibiting (e.g., terminating communication) at least one of the rendering of the content or execution of at least one feature associated with the content (to provide a inhibiting means for content playback for unsuccessful authentication [col. 11, lines 50-67]),

the rendering of the content or execution of at least one feature associated with the content (to provide content rendering capability [col. 11, lines 50-67]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Jaisimha, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the combination of Traw and Feder by employing the well known feature of inhibit content playback disclosed above by Jaisimha, for which playback control will be enhanced (col. 11, 50-67).

11. As to claim 12, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is further adapted to cryptographically authenticate at least one of manufacturer, model, and version of the device executing said program logic (i.e., .. teaches verifying device certificate is valid. [col. 14, lines 60-67]. Those skilled in the art would recognize the device certificate [e.g., X.509] contains version information pertinent to the device).

12. As to claim 13, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is adapted to verify as at least one characteristic of the device whether the device can perform block cipher operations using a key characteristic of at least one of manufacturer, model, and version of the device [316, fig. 3(a)].

13. As to claim 14, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is adapted to verify as at least one characteristic whether unauthorized firmware is present on the device (i.e., ... teaches authenticating software components running on the PC [col. 11, lines 60-67]).

14. As to claim 15, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is configured to access a server over a network and to receive from the server data representing at least one of code configured to identify a new characteristic, code implementing a countermeasure, revocation status, payment information associated with content, download of bonus content, and download of advertisement (i.e., ... teaches each device manufactured will have a unique device ID and public/private DSS key pair .... teaches with unique device IDs and DSS keys, the Digital Transmission Protection Authority will only need to revoke the certificates of the specific devices which have been compromised .... teaches other users who bought the same device model and have not violated the license agreement would not be effected by this revocation [col. 11, lines 50-55]).

15. As to claim 16, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is configured to identify a characteristic by searching a portion of memory of the device [col. 8, lines 18-25].

16. As to claim 17, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is configured to identify a characteristic by accessing non-volatile storage of the device [col. 8, lines 18-25].

17. As to claim 18, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is further configured to make video playable by applying modifications to a video data stream [col. 6, lines 39-46].

18. As to claim 19, Traw teaches a storage medium where said program logic is further configured to change, when applying said modifications, audiovisual content to embed forensic information (i.e., embedded controller) associated with playback environment [col. 6, lines 58-62].

19. As to claim 20, Traw teaches a method the audiovisual player device includes a removable disk player to receive the content [col. 6, lines 40-45],

Traw does not expressly teach the claim limitation element of:

receives the first set of instructions from the disk player, and executes the first set of instructions in the audiovisual player device, such that the request originates from disk.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of Traw as introduced by Feder. Feder discloses:

receives the first set of instructions from the disk player, and executes the first set of instructions in the audiovisual player device, such that the request originates from disk (to provide a first set of instruction from a disk [col. 7, lines 30-67]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Feder, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Tray by employing the well known features of a playback device and playback instruction provided by a storage medium disclosed above by Feder, for which playback control will be enhanced (col. 7, lines 30-60).

20. As to claims 21 and 22, although the system of Traw illustrates substantial features of the claimed invention, Traws does not disclose

A method where the audiovisual player device includes a network connection to receive the content, and wherein the Turing-complete interpreter: receives the first set of instructions from the network, and executes the first set of

instructions in the audiovisual player device, such that the request originates from a network source (claim 21).

A method where the portion of the storage includes a slot reserved for at least one program title; the method further comprising determining whether new content seeks access to a new slot or to an existing slot (claim 22).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traw as introduced by Jaisimha. Jaisimha discloses:

A method where the audiovisual player device includes a network connection to receive the content (to provide a network connection to receive content [fig. 1]), and wherein the Turing-complete interpreter: receives the first set of instructions from the network (to provide capability to send the first set of instruction from the network [fig. 1], and executes the first set of instructions (e.g download) in the audiovisual player device (to provide player capability to execute instruction [304, fig. 3]), such that the request originates from a network source (to provide network instruction (e.g., setting mobile playback parameter) capability for a playback device [606, fig. 6]) (claim 21).

A method where the portion of the storage includes a slot reserved for at least one program title (to provide program title slot capability [406, fig. 4]); the

method further comprising determining whether new content seeks access to a new slot or to an existing slot (to provide access type determination capability [424, fig. 4]) (claim 22).

Therefore, given the teachings of Jaisimha, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Traw by employing the well known feature of providing access type determination capability disclosed above by Jaisimha, for which playback control will be enhanced (fig. 6).

21. As to claims 23 and 24, although the system of Traw illustrates substantial features of the claimed invention, Traws does not disclose

A method where enabling access includes granting access to one of the existing slot and the new slot (claim 23).

A method where enabling access includes Storing at least one of: (i) information regarding payment associated with the content; (ii) a counter value; (iii) spending limit; (iv) permission to access content special features; (v) pay-per-view history; (vi) a privilege level; or (vii) pricing discount information (claim 24).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traw as introduced by Jaisimha. Jaisimha discloses:

A method where enabling access includes granting access to one of the existing slot and the new slot (to provide the capability to selectively enable (e.g. privilege level enablement) access to content [col. 6, lines 5-15]) (claim 23).

A method where enabling access includes Storing at least one of: (i) information regarding payment associated with the content; (ii) a counter value; (iii) spending limit; (iv) permission to access content special features; (v) pay-per-view history; (vi) a privilege level; or (vii) pricing discount information (to provide the capability to selectively enable (e.g. privilege level enablement) access to content [col. 6, lines 5-15]) (claim 24).

Therefore, given the teachings of Jaisimha, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Traw by employing the well known feature of selectively enabling access to content disclosed above by Jaisimha, for which playback control will be enhanced [col. 6, lines 5-15].

22. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha as applied to claim 1 and 11

above, and further in view of Asano et al (WO 0046804 and Asano hereinafter (cited from IDS)).

23. As to claims 25 and 26, although the system of the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha illustrates substantial features of the claimed invention, the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha does not disclose

A method where enabling access includes storing at least one of: (i) information about a security policy; (ii) security vulnerability fix code; (iii) a cryptographic key; (iv) security check data; or (v) a digital signature (claim 25).

A method where the audiovisual player device includes a removable disk player to receive the content, and wherein the device retrieves the software from the disk player and executes the software in the audiovisual player device, such that the reference originates from disk (claim 26).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha as introduced by Asano. Asano discloses:

A method where enabling access includes storing at least one of: (i) information about a security policy; (ii) security vulnerability fix code; (iii) a

cryptographic key; (iv) security check data; or (v) a digital signature (to provide access enablement based on a digital signature [col. 9, 50-55]) (claim 25).

A method where the audiovisual player device includes a removable disk player to receive the content, and wherein the device retrieves the software from the disk player and executes the software in the audiovisual player device, such that the reference originates from disk (to provide disc information retrieval capability [col. 8, lines 63-67]) (claim 26).

Therefore, given the teachings of Asano, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha by employing the well known feature of information retrieval from a disc such that the information is used for security (e.g., authentication) and playback of the content disclosed above by Asano, for which playback control will be enhanced [col. 6, lines 5-15].

24. As to claims 27 and 28, although the system of Traw illustrates substantial features of the claimed invention, Traws does not disclose

A method where the audiovisual player device includes a network connection, and wherein allowing the software portion to access the memory portion includes writing a value arising from a network source into the memory portion (claim 27).

A method where the memory portion includes a slot reserved for at least one program title; the method further comprising determining whether new content seeks access to a new slot or to an existing slot; and allowing the software portion to access the memory portion includes granting access to the existing slot (claim 28).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Traw as introduced by Jaisimha. Jaisimha discloses:

A method where the audiovisual player device includes a network connection (to provide a network connection to receive content [fig. 1]), and wherein allowing the software portion to access the memory portion includes writing (e.g., storing) a value arising from a network source into the memory portion (to provide memory writing capability such that upon access to content the content is stored on memory [col. 4, lines 40-50]) (claim 27).

A method where the memory portion includes a slot reserved for at least one program title (to provide program title slot capability [406, fig. 4]); the method further comprising determining whether new content seeks access to a new slot or to an existing slot (to provide access type determination capability [424, fig. 4]); and allowing the software portion to access the memory portion includes

granting access to the existing slot (e.g., header) (to provide access capability [abstract]) (claim 28).

Therefore, given the teachings of Jaisimha, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Traw by employing the well known features of network connectivity for distribution of content and memory allocation for storing content disclosed above by Jaisimha, for which playback control will be enhanced (fig. 1).

25. As to claim 29, although the system of the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha illustrates substantial features of the claimed invention, the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha does not disclose

A method where inhibiting at least one of the rendering of the content or execution of at least one feature associated with the content includes taking an action selected from a group of: inhibiting access to bonus content, halting playback, reporting an error, requiring additional authentication, requiring a player upgrade, refusing to decode the end of a movie, disabling bonus features, and playing at reduced resolution (claim 29).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha as introduced by Asano. Asano discloses:

A method where inhibiting at least one of the rendering of the content or execution of at least one feature associated with the content includes taking an action selected from a group of: inhibiting access to bonus content, halting playback, reporting an error, requiring additional authentication, requiring a player upgrade, refusing to decode the end of a movie, disabling bonus features, and playing at reduced resolution (to provide the capability to require additional authentication [col. 9, lines 40-67]) (claim 29).

Therefore, given the teachings of Asano, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the combination of Traw, Feder and Jaishimha by employing the well known feature of information retrieval means for information stored on a storage medium utilized for validation disclosed above by Asano, for which playback control will be enhanced [col. 9, lines 40-67].

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYAN WRIGHT whose telephone number is (571)270-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYAZ Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax

Art Unit: 2431

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRYAN WRIGHT/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2431  
/Ayaz R. Sheikh/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431